

**8.8            Socioeconomics**

The Henrietta Peaker Project (HPP) consists of a 91.4-megawatt (MW) (net), natural-gas-fired, simple-cycle power plant located approximately 10 miles southwest of Lemoore, California, on a seven-acre portion of a 20-acre parcel owned by GWF Energy LLC. The HPP will interconnect to the existing adjacent Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) Henrietta Substation through a new 550-foot 70-kilovolt (kV) transmission line supported on two new transmission poles. Other linear facilities include an approximately 16.5-foot water interconnection pipeline (from the site property boundary) and a 2.2-mile Southern California Gas Company natural gas interconnection pipeline. Additionally, approximately five acres will be used for temporary construction laydown and parking.

Socioeconomic issues relevant to the evaluation of environmental impacts include the economy (the labor force, employment, and industry); population and housing; public services and utilities (including fire protection and emergency response, law enforcement, schools, medical facilities, and utilities); and public finance and fiscal issues.

**8.8.1            Affected Environment**

The HPP site is located along 25th Avenue in unincorporated Kings County, approximately one mile south of the 25th Avenue and State Route (SR) 198 intersection and approximately three miles east of the border with Fresno County. Economic and demographic information for Kings County, the nearby counties of Fresno and Kern, and cities near the project site are presented throughout this section. Cities analyzed include Kings County cities and the city of Huron in Fresno County, which is 10 miles west of the project site. Information is also presented for Tulare County.

**8.8.1.1            Labor Force, Employment, and Industry**

Agriculture and related industries predominate in the Kings County economy (EDD, 2001a) and are important in neighboring Kern and Fresno Counties as well. In 2000, the total civilian labor force in Kings County was 45,900 persons, and the unemployment rate was 14 percent (Table 8.8-1; EDD, 2001b). Of the incorporated cities in Kings County, Avenal had the highest unemployment rate in 2000 (21.2 percent), followed by Corcoran (16.1 percent),

Lemoore (14.3 percent), and Hanford (12.3 percent). The city of Huron in Fresno County had an unemployment rate of approximately 15 percent, which is generally comparable to the unemployment rates of the four Kings County cities. Fresno County had an unemployment rate comparable to that of Kings County (14.3 percent), but Kern County's rate was slightly lower (11.3 percent). The unemployment rates in the three counties were more than double the rate of the state of California as a whole in 2000 (4.9 percent). The agricultural nature of the economy in these counties results in seasonal employment fluctuations, and unemployment rates likely fluctuate throughout the year.

Tables 8.8-2, 8.8-3, and 8.8-4 show 1998 and 1999 employment by industry for Kings, Kern, and Fresno Counties, respectively. As shown in Table 8.8-2, the highest percentages of employment in Kings County are in government, farm, trade, and services. In 1998, the government sector represented one-third of total employment in Kings County, due primarily to the presence of Naval Air Station (NAS) Lemoore (1,400 civilian employees), Avenal State Prison (1,300 employees), and two correctional facilities in Corcoran (2,900 employees) (KEDC, 2001). Farm production and services in Kings County represented over one-fifth of total employment, and wholesale and retail trade represented slightly less than one-fifth of total employment. The services sector (hotels, lodging, and health) employed approximately 15 percent of the total employees in Kings County. Construction and mining employment was approximately 1,000 in 1999.

The State of California Employment Development Department (EDD) expects an average annual growth rate in nonfarm employment of 2.8 percent between 1997 and 2004. Recent years reflect conservative growth (i.e., Kings County experienced a 3.4 percent average annual increase in nonfarm employment between 1993 and 2000). From 1998 to 1999, farm production and services decreased by an average annual rate of 0.2 percent (EDD, 2001c).

The government division, which accounted for 11,040 jobs in Kings County in 1999, continues to be the largest nonfarm industry in Kings County. Two state prisons in Corcoran, one state prison in Avenal, and NAS Lemoore account for most of the jobs in the government division. As the Kings County population grows (see Section 8.8.1.2), government

employment will increase in the form of public school educators and general government support employees.

Table 8.8-3 shows total farm and nonfarm employment in Kern County. The highest percentages of total employment within Kern County are in the government, services, farming, and trade sectors. Government employment represents approximately one-fifth of Kern County employment, and most of this employment is at Edwards Air Force Base, located in the southeast portion of the county. Services (business, health, engineering, management, and other services), wholesale and retail trade, and farming each account for approximately one-fifth of Kern County employment. The construction workforce includes approximately 10,000 workers, representing roughly 4 percent of total employment.

Total employment by industry for Fresno County is presented in Table 8.8-4. The sectors with the highest employment are services, trade, government, and farming. Service-related jobs, wholesale and retail trade, and government employment each represent approximately one-fifth of total employment. The construction and mining sector employed 14,800 workers in 1999, representing approximately 5 percent of Fresno County employment.

In 1999, Tulare County's employment was 127,900, representing approximately 40 percent of Fresno County employment and 55 percent of Kern County employment. The county economy is strong in agricultural commodity production, packing and shipping operations, and light and medium manufacturing plants (Tulare County, 2001). Visalia is the county seat. Farming represented 27 percent of total employment in 2000, followed by government (21 percent), retail trade (15 percent), and services (15 percent). Manufacturing represents approximately 9 percent of county employment (EDD, 2001d). Of the Tulare County civilian labor force of 170,100, 15 percent was unemployed in 2000 (Table 8.8-1; EDD, 2001d).

Table 8.8-5 shows labor unions in the area that provide workforces for construction projects in the three-county area of Kings, Fresno and Kern Counties. Private and commercial contractors also operate in Fresno and Kern Counties.

**8.8.1.2 Population and Housing**

**Population.** Kings County includes the four incorporated cities of Avenal, Corcoran, Hanford, and Lemoore and comprises 1,396 square miles of land (Kings County, 2001a). The unincorporated population of Kings County accounted for 28 percent of the total county population in 2000. Available historical and projected population data for Kings County, broken down into incorporated cities and unincorporated area, are presented in Table 8.8-6. The same data for the city of Huron in Fresno County, Kern County itself, Fresno County, and the state of California are also included in Table 8.8-6.

Annual population growth rates (historic and projected) are shown in Table 8.8-7 for the period 1981 to 2010. The population of Kings County increased from 75,100 in 1981 to 131,200 in 2000, for an average annual increase of 3 percent. By 2020, the Kings County population is expected to reach 186,600 (CDF, 2001). Kern County and Fresno County had larger populations than Kings County (658,900 and 805,000 residents, respectively) in 2000. However, both counties grew slightly slower than Kings County during the 1981–2000 period: Kern County grew 2.5 percent annually, on average, and Fresno County grew 2.3 percent annually, on average. The state as a whole grew 1.9 percent annually on average during the same period. Since 1990, the majority of population growth in Kings County has occurred in the incorporated cities. The unincorporated areas of Kings County had an average annual population growth rate of 0.7 percent from 1990 to 2000.

The California Department of Finance (CDF) expects the population of Kings County to grow at an annual average rate of 1.7 percent between 2000 and 2010. Kern County will grow slightly faster (2.7 percent) and Fresno County will grow at the same rate as Kings County.

In January 2001, Tulare County had 377,500 residents, 25 percent of whom lived in the city of Visalia, followed by 12 percent in the city of Tulare, and 11 percent in the city of Porterville. From 1990 to 2000, the county's population grew at an average of 1.7 percent annually, slightly faster than the state and slower than Kern, Fresno, and Kings Counties (see Table 8.8-7). Cities with the highest annual average growth rate during this period included Visalia (2.5 percent), Porterville (2.5 percent), Tulare (2.3 percent), Farmersville (2.1 percent),

and Dinuba (2.1 percent). Tulare County population is expected to grow to 469,509 by 2010 and to 569,896 by 2020, representing an average of 2 percent annual growth from 2001 to 2010, and from 2010 to 2020 (Tables 8.8-6 and 8.8-7; CDF, 2001).

The closest residences to the project site are condominiums on NAS Lemoore property. In addition to its role as a military base and employment center for Kings County, NAS Lemoore is a residential community for Navy personnel and their families. The condominiums closest to the project site are approximately 0.7 miles east of the intersection of SR 198 and 25th Avenue, bordering SR 198, which is approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the project site.

**Demographics and Poverty Level.** Both 1990 and 2000 Census data were used for this analysis, as 2000 census data showing the number of minority residents (excluding only white non-Hispanic/Latino) had not yet been released in June 2001.<sup>1</sup>

Census data from 1990 show that the demographic composition of Kings County and the surrounding counties is diverse; slightly over half of the population in each of the counties is white non-Hispanic. Forty-six percent of Kings County residents are minority, including nonwhite races and persons who listed themselves as Hispanic or Latino white. The same measures for Fresno and Kern Counties were 49 percent and 37 percent, respectively.

Based on the 2000 Census, 44 percent of Kings County was nonwhite, while 43 percent and 36 percent of Fresno and Kern Counties were nonwhite, respectively.<sup>2</sup> In 2000, about 5 percent of the residents of these counties listed themselves as “more than one race.” In terms of ethnic origin, 44 percent of the population in Kings County was Hispanic or Latino in 2000. In Fresno and Kern Counties, 44 percent and 38 percent of the population was Hispanic or Latino in 2000, respectively. Whether the minority percentage in the counties has increased since 1990 is not discernible, since the number of white non-Hispanics was not available from the 2000 Census in June 2001.

---

<sup>1</sup> The number of persons of nonwhite races was available for 2000 in June 2001. However, since Hispanic/Latino origin by race in 2000 was not available in June 2001, the number of Hispanic or Latino whites was not available, and therefore the number of minority persons could not be estimated using the 2000 Census data.

<sup>2</sup> The 2000 race percentages include all “one race” races except white, and the category of “more than one race.”

In 1990, 16 percent of Kings County residents, 21 percent of Fresno County residents, 16 percent of Kern County residents, and 22 percent of Tulare County residents lived below the poverty level. Table 8.8-8 shows the demographic profiles and poverty statistics of Kings, Kern, Fresno, and Tulare Counties as well as the incorporated cities in Kings County and the city of Huron in Fresno County.

Table 8.8-8 indicates that the incorporated cities in Kings County have a higher percentage of minority residents than Kings County in its entirety, suggesting that the unincorporated portions of Kings County are less racially diverse.

**Housing.** Housing information for Kings County and the neighboring counties of Kern, Fresno, and Tulare are shown in Table 8.8-9, along with housing information for the cities in Kings County and the city of Huron in Fresno County. In January 2000, the housing stock for Kings County was an estimated 37,018 dwelling units, consisting of 74 percent single-family homes, 20 percent multiple-family dwellings, and 6 percent mobile homes or trailers. The residential vacancy rate for Kings County was 6.2 percent at that time, which was lower than the state of California's vacancy rate of 7.4 percent, indicating a slightly tighter housing market in Kings County than in the state as a whole. Kern County had 234,487 housing units in January 2000 and a vacancy rate of 8.5 percent. Also in January 2000, Fresno County's housing supply was 273,159 housing units, and the vacancy rate was 6.1 percent. Tulare County had 121,707 housing units in January 2000 and a vacancy rate of 6.6 percent.

The supply of temporary housing is greater in Kern and Fresno Counties than in Kings County. However, the city of Lemoore in Kings County has two motels with a combined total of 127 rooms. Lemoore is approximately 10 miles east and within a 15-minute driving distance of the site. The city of Hanford in Kings County, approximately 20 miles northwest and within a half-hour driving distance of the site, has nine hotels, including two large chain hotels with a combined total of 227 rooms. Avenal and Corcoran in Kings County have one hotel each (KEDC, 2001). The larger cities of Fresno and Bakersfield are approximately 40 miles north and 80 miles south of the project site, respectively. The city of Fresno has 75 hotels or motels with approximately 7,000 rooms (FCVB, 2001). Bakersfield, the largest city in Kern County, has 33 hotels or motels with approximately 4,300 rooms (Belluomini, 2001).

**8.8.1.3 Public Services and Utilities**

**Fire Protection and Emergency Response.** The Kings County Fire Department (KCFD) provides countywide fire protection services, including fire inspection, limited emergency medical and first aid, suppression and protection, arson inspection, and weed abatement. The department headquarters are located in Hanford, and 11 KCFD fire stations operate countywide (Kings County, 2001a). The Number 7 Station is the closest to the project site and will be the “first response” station, as it is approximately 7.5 miles from the site. The Number 10 Station will provide backup response and is located approximately nine miles from the site (10-minute response time). Each of the two stations is staffed with one firefighter and 15 volunteers. The Number 10 Station has a 2,500-gallon engine, and the Number 7 Station is equipped with a 1,000-gallon engine. The KCFD has a mutual-aid agreement with NAS Lemoore, which could respond to an emergency at the project site in three to four minutes (Virden, 2001).

American Ambulance provides ambulance service to the project site. The closest ambulance and staff to the site are stationed in Lemoore, and the second closest are in the city of Hanford. The ambulance based in Lemoore could respond to an emergency at the site in eight to nine minutes (Virden, 2001).

**Law Enforcement.** The Kings County Sheriff’s Department (KCSO) provides law enforcement services to the county, serves as the public administrator and county coroner, and operates the county jail in Hanford. The KCSO has over 200 employees and 73 sworn officers, and patrols four beats throughout the county. The KCSO would provide law enforcement services to the project site at all times, based out of its Hanford headquarters. The department also has mutual-aid agreements statewide (Wheat, 2001).

**Schools.** The project site is within the boundaries of two school districts: the Central Union Elementary School District (Central Union) and the Lemoore Union High School District (Lemoore Union). Central Union educates students in grades K through 8, and Lemoore Union educates students in grades 9 through 12. The closest schools to the project site are Akers Elementary School and Neutra Elementary School, both of which are approximately two miles north of the site.

In Kings County, 25,364 students attended schools during the 2000–2001 school year. In Hanford, seven school districts serve grades K–12. The projected K–12 enrollment for the 2002–2003 school year is 11,319 students, an increase of 720 students (3 percent) over current levels (GWF, 2000). Community colleges and adult education programs are also provided throughout Kings County.

Table 8.8-10 shows current and projected enrollment and school capacity in the districts where the project site is located. The enrollment in these districts is not expected to grow substantially, and the schools are not over capacity.

**Medical Facilities.** The closest medical facilities to the project site are in Hanford, Corcoran, Avenal, and Fresno. Medical facilities within Kings County include the following:

- Avenal Hospital District, 317 E. Alpine Street, Avenal
- Corcoran District Hospital, 1310 Hanna Avenue, Corcoran
- Central Valley Comprehensive Care, 869 W. Lacey Boulevard, Hanford
- Central Valley General Hospital, 1025 N. Douty, Hanford
- Douty Health Clinic, 1000 N. Douty, Hanford
- Hacienda Health Care, 361 E. Grangeville Boulevard, Hanford
- Hanford Community Medical Center, Adventist Health, 450 Greenfield Avenue, Hanford
- Hanford Nursing & Rehabilitation Hospital, 1007 W. Lacey Boulevard, Hanford
- Kerr Outpatient Center, 470 Greenfield Avenue, Hanford (Kings County, 2001b)

Fresno has several medical centers that could also serve the project site if necessary. American Ambulance would provide ambulance service to the project site. The closest stationed ambulance, based in Lemoore, has a response time to the project site of eight to nine minutes (Viriden, 2001).

**Utilities.** The project site is currently not served with potable water or sewer service, as the site is used for agricultural purposes. PG&E supplies electricity to the project site vicinity. PG&E supplies natural gas to Avenal, and the Southern California Gas Company supplies natural gas to the cities of Corcoran, Lemoore, and Hanford (KEDC, 2001). All nonhazardous waste from the city of Lemoore goes to the local materials recovery facility, where it is sorted and recyclables are removed. The remaining waste is then transferred to the Chemical Waste Management facility in Kettleman City. The Kings Waste Recycling Authority has an agreement with Chemical Waste Management to send nonhazardous waste from the cities of Lemoore, Hanford, and Corcoran to the Class II/III Kettleman Hills Facility (Cooke, 2001). Telephone service is provided to Kings County by Pacific Bell and by GTE (KEDC, 2001).

#### **8.8.1.4 Public Finance and Fiscal Issues**

For fiscal year (FY) 2000/2001, Kings County adopted a revenue budget of approximately \$136 million. Intergovernmental revenue accounts for approximately \$86 million, taxes generate about \$15 million, and charges for services generate approximately \$8 million. Table 8.8-11 summarizes the revenue sources for Kings County for FY 1998/1999 through FY 2000/2001. The FY 2001/2002 budget had not been adopted as of June 2001.

Table 8.8-12 shows how the FY 2000/2001 funds were allocated. The allocated percentage of the budget for each department and the percentage change from the FY actual 1999/2000 budget is also shown.

Welfare received the largest percentage of FY 2000/2001 budget appropriations (31 percent), followed by public safety (27 percent), and capital outlay (18 percent). Other funds that received appropriations included health (11 percent), general government (7 percent), and public transportation (4 percent). Internal service funds, education, and recreation each received 1 percent of appropriations.

For construction that occurs in Kings County, the County receives the sales tax revenue on the nonlabor cost, at 1 percent of total sales. The revenue goes to the County's general fund and is used for general government uses (Nikoghosian, 2001).

The total assessed value of all secured property in Kings County was \$4.4 billion in FY 2000/2001 (Dorna, 2001), and the total property tax revenue collected was approximately \$46 million (Nikoghosian, 2001). In Kings County, 47 percent of the property tax revenue is distributed to the general fund, the library, and the fire district; 34 percent to education; 8 percent to the cities; 4 percent to utilities, hospitals, and other services; 4 percent to other funds; and 3 percent to redevelopment agencies or funds (Dorna, 2001). Kings County levies property tax at 1 percent of the assessed value of the property. Depending on the tax code area, an additional tax for school capital facility needs could apply (Nikoghosian, 2001).

### **8.8.2 Environmental Consequences**

Local and regional socioeconomic impacts attributable to the HPP were determined by evaluating projected demands from the construction, operation, and maintenance of the HPP relative to existing conditions. Construction, operation, and maintenance of the HPP are not expected to result in significant socioeconomic impacts to the local area or region.

#### **8.8.2.1 Significance Criteria**

Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines provides criteria for determining whether project-related socioeconomic impacts would be significant. Impacts attributable to the project are considered significant if they would:

- Induce substantial growth or concentration of population;
- Induce substantial increases in demand for public services and utilities;
- Displace a large number of people;
- Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community; or
- Result in substantial long-term disruptions to businesses.

#### **8.8.2.2 Economic Impacts**

**Direct Construction Impacts.** HPP construction will occur over five months, beginning in January 2002 and ending in May 2002. Primary trades in demand include manual staff, consisting of pipefitters, electricians, laborers, and millwrights, and contractor staff. Table

8.8-13 shows the HPP schedule and the estimated construction personnel requirements by trade and month. Total construction personnel requirements will be approximately 373 personnel months, peaking at 93 personnel during month 4 of construction.

As shown in Table 8.8-2, Kings County had approximately 1,000 construction and mining workers in 1999. The demand for construction labor attributable to the HPP will not likely be met within Kings County; therefore, construction workers will originate from nonlocal areas and commute on a daily basis. For the purpose of analysis, an estimated 50 percent of the construction workers (48 peak workers) are assumed to commute from Bakersfield or Kern County, approximately 35 percent (34 peak workers) from Fresno or Fresno County, and the remaining 15 percent (15 peak workers) from Kings or Tulare Counties.

During the five-month construction period, an average of 75<sup>3</sup> workers will work daytime shifts at the HPP site from Monday through Saturday. Based on the percentages above, an average of 38 workers will commute from Kern County, an average of 26 workers from Fresno County, and an average of 11 workers from Kings and Tulare Counties. Table 8.10-5 in Section 8.10 (Traffic and Transportation) shows the average distribution of the workforce. The project could draw from the labor unions listed in Table 8.8-5 for project construction. An adequate construction labor force exists in Kings, Kern, Fresno, and Tulare Counties to meet the demand attributable to the HPP.

The total construction cost of the proposed project is anticipated to be approximately \$84 million. Table 8.8-14 shows that labor costs (including base wages, benefits, taxes, and overtime) represents approximately one-tenth of the total cost. The remainder of the cost, approximately \$76 million, will be spent on materials, equipment, and other nonlabor items. An estimated \$2.1 million (3.5 percent) of the cost of construction materials and equipment will be spent in Kings County (Kieffer, 2001).

**Indirect and Induced Economic Impacts from Construction.** Construction activity will support secondary economic impacts (indirect and induced impacts) that will occur within Kings County and the surrounding larger region, depending on where labor originates

---

<sup>3</sup> The average number of workers was determined by dividing the total worker-months (373) by the number of months in the construction period (5).

(where labor income is spent) and where materials and supplies are purchased. Secondary employment effects include indirect employment due to the purchase of goods and services by firms involved with construction, and induced employment due to construction workers spending their income in the local area. Using an IMPLAN multiplier<sup>4</sup> for the four-county area of 1.5 and the average number of workers (75), the number of indirect and induced jobs supported during construction is approximately 39, for a total impact of 116 jobs in the four-county area. The total employment impacts to Kings County will be a small portion of the 116 employees, as construction employees will commute to the project site from outside the county, and much of the labor income that is earned from construction will be spent outside Kings County. These impacts will be temporary, since they are attributable to temporary construction activities, and will lag behind the direct effects of construction by approximately 6 to 12 months.

**Direct Operation and Maintenance Impacts.** The proposed HPP will begin operating in June 2002. Operation and maintenance personnel for the proposed project will be provided from other GWF operating facilities. Therefore, there will be no new operation and maintenance jobs created by the HPP. The maximum number of employees on site at the HPP during normal operating conditions will range from one (an operator) to four (a supervisor, operator, an instrument technician, and a mechanic). Operation and maintenance personnel from the Hanford Cogeneration Power Plant will be dispatched to the HPP when the proposed project is scheduled to operate.

---

<sup>4</sup> IMPLAN Professional Version 2.0, copyright Minnesota IMPLAN Group, 1997. The multiplier 1.5 was the industry output multiplier (induced and indirect) for Sector #51, New Streets and Highways, for the study area of Kings, Kern, Tulare, and Fresno Counties.

The total cost of annual operation and maintenance of the HPP will be approximately \$2.5 million, as shown in Table 8.8-15. Approximately \$32,000 (5.9 percent of the costs of materials and supplies) will be spent locally.

### **Indirect and Induced Economic Impacts from Operation and Maintenance.**

Operation and maintenance of the HPP will support no secondary economic impacts (indirect and induced impacts). There will be no secondary impacts from operation and maintenance as there will be no new employees associated with HPP.

### **8.8.2.3 Population and Housing Impacts**

**Construction.** Construction of the HPP will not cause substantial permanent population increases or changes in the concentration of population due to the temporary nature and relatively short time period for construction. Construction workers will be a temporary addition to the Kings County population during the daytime. During the day, workers could purchase food, gasoline, and other miscellaneous items in the area. All workers will be daily commuters and will therefore not need overnight lodging. However, if workers were to require temporary lodging, such lodging is available in Hanford, Avenal, and Corcoran, as well as in Fresno and Bakersfield. The temporary influx of construction workers will not place demands on the local lodging industry that could not be met. The secondary (indirect and induced) impacts associated with construction are not expected to result in a substantial impact on population or housing in the area. The number of secondary employees will be small, and the jobs will be temporary. Housing availability and vacancy rates in the area indicate that any new residents associated with secondary employment attributable to construction will be able to find adequate housing.

**Operation and Maintenance.** HPP operation and maintenance will not cause any change in population or in the concentration of population, because there are no new employees required to operate the HPP. The employees will commute on a daily basis; therefore, no demand for permanent housing or temporary lodging will result. Operation and maintenance workers could spend income in the local area surrounding the HPP on items such as food and gasoline. However, this increase in spending will not be significant relative to spending in Kings County. Secondary (indirect and induced) employment associated with the

operation and maintenance of the HPP is not expected to occur since there will be no new employees associated with HPP.

#### **8.8.2.4 Impacts on Public Services and Utilities**

**Fire Protection, Emergency Response, and Law Enforcement Services.** The construction of the proposed HPP will result in slight increases in demand for public services, as the construction workforce will average 75 workers, and construction will last approximately five months. The KCSD and the KCFD will serve the project site during construction, operation, and maintenance. The increased demand for service will not be substantial in relation to the service areas for each department. The KCFD has adequate resources to accommodate the additional demand placed on the department as a result of HPP construction, operation, and maintenance (Virden, 2001). The KCSD also has adequate resources to accommodate the additional demand resulting from the HPP (Wheat, 2001).

**Schools.** The construction, operation, and maintenance of the HPP will not result in an increase in the local student population or have an adverse impact on the ability of the school district to provide educational services. Construction workers and production employees will commute to the site on a daily basis and are not expected to temporarily or permanently relocate with their families, due to the adequate nearby labor force and the short construction period. Few if any additional students will attend Kings County schools as a result of the HPP.

The school impact fees resulting from construction of the HPP will support education in Kings County. The current school impact fee is \$0.33 per square foot of covered and enclosed structure space for commercial or industrial development (Corl, 2001). The covered and closed structures to be built at the HPP site are approximately 14,000 square feet, which results in a school impact fee of \$4,620 to be paid by the owners of the HPP. Using the breakdown of property tax revenue allocations (see Section 8.8.1.4) and the increase in property tax revenues attributable to the project (Section 8.8.2.5), an estimated \$50,000 in property tax revenues will be generated for education in Kings County on an annual basis as a result of the HPP.

**Medical Facilities.** The impact of the HPP on hospitals and ambulances in the area will not be substantial. Medical facilities will be able to accommodate the potential demand for additional services. See Section 8.7 (Worker Health and Safety) for more information about the safety procedures to be used during construction.

**Utilities.** The construction, operation, and maintenance of the HPP will not have a substantial impact on electricity and gas, sewer, water, or telephone service in the area. The HPP project includes construction of an approximately two-mile natural gas pipeline that will connect to the Southern California Gas Company Line 800 south of the site, as discussed in Section 7.0 (Natural Gas Supply). The pipeline will be installed along existing roads and will not interrupt any agricultural production. In addition, a new 70-kV transmission line will connect the HPP to the PG&E Henrietta Substation. The transmission line will be approximately 550 feet in length and will not transect any agricultural land.

The HPP will obtain its process water and fire water from Westlands Water District and Kings County through an existing water supply line owned and operated by Westlands Water District. No improvements in the water line are necessary to supply the project, and no existing water customers will be curtailed. Bottled water will be delivered to the site for drinking and other domestic purposes. There will be no wastewater discharged to a publicly owned treatment system. A septic system will be installed at the site. Refuse pickup and both public and private waste haulers will provide disposal services for the project site. Where appropriate, wastes will be recycled; any remaining wastes will be temporarily stored until periodic disposal at the Class III Hanford Sanitary Landfill. PG&E will provide electricity service to the HPP site, and Southern California Gas Company will provide natural gas service.

### 8.8.2.5 Fiscal Impacts

The sales tax revenue attributable to purchase of construction materials and equipment for the HPP will be approximately \$4.4 million. Approximately \$160,000 of the \$4.4 million will result from taxed purchases within Kings County. Of the 7.25 percent tax rate (\$160,000), 6 percent will go to the State of California (\$126,000) and the remaining 1.25 percent (\$26,000) will go to Kings County.

The school impact fees resulting from HPP construction will support education in Kings County and will be approximately \$4,620.

Kings County taxes secure property at 1 percent of assessed value, unless an additional educational capital facilities levy is added. For the project site parcel, the property tax rate is approximately 1.06 percent, including the 1 percent standard property tax in addition to a school levy that pays bonds for West Hills College and Lemoore High School (Dorna, 2001). The total assessed value of secured property in Kings County in FY 2000/2001 was approximately \$4.4 billion (Dorna, 2001). Assuming the assessed value of the project site parcel will increase by the value of construction (\$84 million), the increase in property tax revenue that will accrue to Kings County is approximately \$900,000 annually, of which \$50,000 will go toward paying the two school bonds. The rest of the property taxes will be allocated according to the breakdown discussed in Section 8.8.1.4. The valuation of the HPP is based on components related to its anticipated revenue-generating capability, including production capacity, amount and term of income stream, expenses, discount rate, and present value at the end of the term. Therefore, property tax revenue could vary annually depending on facility revenue.

To support operation and maintenance, the HPP will make local purchases of about \$32,000 annually in equipment and supplies. The purchases will generate approximately \$2,400 annually in sales tax revenue in Kings County.

### **8.8.3 Environmental Justice**

Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations* (1994), requires federal government agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse effects of federal actions on the health or environment of minority and low-income populations. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) has published several guidelines for addressing environmental justice issues, including *Draft Title VI Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs* and *Draft Revised Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits* (U.S. EPA, 2000a, b).

In recent environmental justice analyses, the CEC has used consistent methodology under U.S. EPA guidelines. Under current U.S. EPA methodology and CEC practice, for potential environmental justice impacts to exist, an environmental justice population must be present within six miles of a project site, and the project must result in “high and adverse” impacts that affect the environmental justice populations disproportionately. Under U.S. EPA guidance, an environmental justice population exists if the percentage of the population that is minority is over 50 percent. The 50 percent threshold can also be applied to low-income residents.

A six-mile-radius area centered on the HPP site includes parts of Kings and Fresno Counties. In 1990, Kings County and Fresno County residents were 46 and 49 percent minority, respectively (see Table 8.8-8). As shown in Figure 8.8-1, the six-mile-radius area includes parts of census tracts 2, 3, 4.02, and 16/16.01<sup>5</sup> in Kings County and census tract 78 in Fresno County. In 1990, the percentage of minority residents in the census tracts ranged from approximately 23 to 96 percent.

Census 2000 data indicate that the nonwhite population in Kings County and Fresno County was 46 percent in both counties. In addition, the percentage of the population that was Hispanic or Latino in 2000 was 44 percent in both counties.<sup>6</sup> The five census tracts surrounding the project site ranged from 25 to 70 percent nonwhite, and from 17 to 76 percent Hispanic or Latino.

In 1990, 16 and 21 percent of residents of Kings and Fresno Counties, respectively, lived below the poverty level (see Table 8.8-1). The range of percentage of residents living below the poverty level by individual census tract within the six-mile-radius area was 11 to 39 percent in 1990. Poverty statistics by census tract for 2000 were not available from Census 2000 in July 2001.

---

<sup>5</sup> 1990 Census boundaries label this census tract as census tract 16, while 2000 Census boundaries label the census tract at 16.01.

<sup>6</sup> Both 1990 and 2000 Census data were used for this analysis because 2000 census data showing the number of minority residents (excluding only white non-Hispanic/Latino) had not yet been released in July 2001. The number of persons of nonwhite races was available for 2000 in June 2001. However, since Hispanic/Latino origin *by race* in 2000 was not available in July 2001, the number of Hispanic or Latino whites was not available, and therefore, the number of minority persons could not be estimated for comparison to 1990 data or true representation of a minority percentage.

The census tracts with minority percentages over 50 percent are census tract 16/16.01 (76 percent in 1990) and census tract 78 (96 percent in 1990). A portion of each census tract falls into the six-mile-radius area; however, the only population center that falls into this area is the town of Stratford in Kings County, which is approximately 5.5 miles southeast of the site. Stratford is approximately 67 percent nonwhite and 76 percent Hispanic/Latino according to the 2000 Census. Minority and/or low-income data are not available from the 1990 Census, because Stratford was not considered a designated “place” in 1990 by the Census Bureau.

The town of Stratford appears to be an environmental justice population based on the U.S. EPA’s 50 percent rule. In 2000, the percentage of the population that was minority in Stratford was 20 percentage points higher than in Kings County and 26 percentage points higher than in the state as a whole.

If significant impacts are found to be attributable to the proposed project, an environmental justice impact could also result if the impacts fall disproportionately on this population compared to other populations within the affected area.

According to the Kings County Health Department, Division of Environmental Health Services (Fillmore, 2001), no known public health studies pertaining to environmental impacts have been performed for specific populations in Kings County within six miles of the project site. The California Department of Health Services has not performed any health studies of populations within the six-mile area (Neutra, 2001).

Permitted air emission sources within six miles of each project site include two cotton-ginning facilities, a government office, a portable equipment facility, and a concrete batching facility (see Figure 8.8-1) (SJVAPCD, 2001). None of the five air emission sources is a Title 5 permitted facility. During operation, the proposed project will also be a pollution source (see Section 8.1, Air Quality, for more information).

The VISTA Information Systems Environmental Database was searched for records of hazardous sites within six miles of the project site (VISTA, 2001).<sup>7</sup> The nearest hazardous site reported by VISTA is approximately 0.2 miles northwest of the project site. The locations and summary descriptions of the sites are presented in Figure 8.8-1. VISTA reported the following records:

- 23 sites with leaking underground storage tanks
- 1 solid waste landfill
- 16 sites with an emergency response notification of spills classification
- 1 RCRA-registered generator of hazardous waste
- 3 sites listed in the state index of properties with hazardous waste
- 1 RCRA violation/enforcement action

Other sections of this AFC evaluate project-related environmental impacts, such as Section 8.1 (Air Quality), Section 8.5 (Noise), Section 8.6 (Public Health), Section 8.10 (Traffic and Transportation), Section 8.11 (Visual Resources), Section 8.12 (Hazardous Materials), and Section 8.14 (Water Resources). The impacts associated with each of these areas are summarized below.

**Air Quality.** Maximum air quality impacts from both construction and operation of the HPP are summarized in Tables 8.1-18 and 8.1-19, respectively. The locations of maximum impact vary by averaging period, but are generally within 2.2 miles of the HPP. Concentrations at the location of the Stratford environmental justice population are substantially lower than the values shown in Tables 8.1-18 and 8.1-19, as the environmental justice population is further from the HPP (approximately 5.5 miles away).

---

<sup>7</sup> VISTA database lists include hazardous waste sites permitted by U.S. EPA (Toxic Release Inventory Sites) and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. Databases were searched for properties within a 6-mile radius of the site, according to availability of data. Databases searched to six miles included U.S. EPA's National Priority List and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Actions, and the State equivalent priority list. Databases searched to 5.5 miles include the U.S. EPA RCRA permitted treatment, storage, and disposal facilities; sites under review by U.S. EPA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act/No Further Remedial Action Planned); the state-equivalent CERCLIS list; Leaking Underground Storage Tanks; and solid waste landfills, incinerators, or transfer stations. Databases searched to 5.25 miles included the state/county registered underground storage tanks list and the state's registered

Tables 8.1-18 and 8.1-19 demonstrate that even at the point of maximum impact, construction of the HPP will not cause a new violation of applicable air quality standards for carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and sulfur dioxide. Although a violation of the 24-hour particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) standard is predicted at the point of maximum impact, and the area is designated as nonattainment, the HPP impacts are small relative to background levels and will be substantially lower at the location of the environmental justice population. Mitigation measures will be applied during construction and operation to limit PM<sub>10</sub> impacts, and the impacts during construction will be short term, potentially occurring only under limited conditions during the five-month construction period. The region is also considered to be in nonattainment with applicable state and federal ozone standards. Emission offsets provided by the HPP will create a net reduction in regional emissions of ozone precursors and PM<sub>10</sub>.

**Noise.** As described in Section 8.5.4, noise will be barely audible during construction and will be inaudible during operation at the nearest receptor, approximately 1.5 miles from the HPP. Because sound levels decrease markedly with distance and the environmental justice population is more than three times the distance to the most sensitive receptor, noise impacts from the HPP will be imperceptible at the location of the environmental justice population.

**Public Health.** Table 8.6-4 demonstrates that the acute hazard index, chronic hazard index, and cancer risk impacts associated with the HPP will be 0.0035, 0.000785, and 0.0296, respectively, at the point of maximum impact. These impacts are well below the recognized significance thresholds for acute, chronic, and cancer risk of 1.0, 1.0, and one in 1 million, respectively. The HPP impacts at the environmental justice population location, over three miles from the point of maximum impact, will be even further below these significance thresholds.

**Traffic and Transportation.** As shown in Table 8.7-7, construction of the HPP will not change the level of service on any regional highways or roadways in the vicinity of the site. Trip generation during operation will be substantially lower than during the construction

---

aboveground storage tanks list. Databases searched to 5.125 miles included U.S. EPA's RCRA-registered small or large generators of hazardous waste, and the U.S. EPA/State Emergency Response Notification System and state spills lists.

period. Therefore, any impacts to roadways in the vicinity of the environmental justice population will be insignificant during construction and operation of the HPP.

**Visual Resources.** The HPP site is not visible from the environmental justice population due to its distance from the site, as well as line-of-sight interference from intervening terrain and land uses. Therefore, there are no impacts to visual resources at the environmental justice population.

**Hazardous Materials.** No materials handled during construction of the HPP have the potential to impact the environmental justice population, which is 5.5 miles away. Offsite consequence modeling described in Section 8.12 demonstrates that potential offsite impacts of ammonia in the unlikely event of a spill at the site would be well below any levels of public health concern. No other hazardous materials handled during operation have the potential for offsite consequences for the environmental justice population.

**Water Resources.** The HPP will receive water under existing entitlements and thus will not impact the water supply to the environmental justice population. There will be no wastewater discharges from the HPP to either surface water or ground water. Therefore, the HPP will not impact water quality in the vicinity of the environmental justice population.

Potential environmental impacts have been evaluated and mitigation recommended, if needed, so that the impacts are not significant. Therefore, because there are no significant environmental impacts, no significant disproportionate impacts will occur for any population in the project's area of influence, including the environmental justice population.

### 8.8.4 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative adverse socioeconomic impacts could potentially result from a project if construction or operational demands, when combined with similar demands from one or more other projects in the region, exceed or undermine available resources. Other future or proposed projects in the area include a cellular communication tower and a cheese processing facility in Lemoore (Kinney, 2001). The cellular communication tower would not result in a large increase in nearby population or employment; the cheese processing facility could result in an increase in employment in Lemoore. These two projects would not likely have a substantial impact on

population near the HPP, due to the types of projects and their locations in Lemoore. Therefore, cumulative impacts on population are expected to be less than significant, and subsequent impacts on the ability to provide public services are also expected to be less than significant.

### **8.8.5 Growth-Inducing Impacts**

The HPP project is not expected to result in substantial growth-inducing impacts, as no direct or indirect relocations will result from the HPP. However, positive economic impacts and increased power generation capability will support potential future growth opportunities in the county and the region.

### **8.8.6 Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards**

The laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS) applicable to socioeconomic conditions and the potential impacts of the proposed project include Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice), CEQA, and the school impact fees imposed by Kings County. Table 8.8-16 summarizes HPP compliance with applicable LORS pertaining to socioeconomic impacts.

#### **8.8.6.1 Federal**

Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Population* (Executive Order 12898, 1994), requires federal government agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse effects of federal actions on the health or environment of minority and low-income populations. The U.S. EPA has adopted the order, and the California EPA has established a working group for environmental justice concerns. The CEC receives federal funding and therefore must address environmental justice concerns associated with projects under its permitting jurisdiction. Environmental justice concerns related to the HPP are addressed in Section 8.8.3.

#### **8.8.6.2 State**

This analysis of the potential socioeconomic impacts attributable to the proposed project is based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. CEQA governs economic and social effects of a project to the extent that the effects result in physical impacts to the environment,

such as substantial growth in population, displacement of a large number of people, or disruption to or division of the physical arrangement of an established community. Other potential impacts include changes in community interaction patterns or social organizations, structures, or institutions; effects on community attitudes, values, or perceptions; or substantial inequities in the distribution of project costs and benefits.

### **8.8.6.3 Local**

California Code of Regulations Sections 65770–65981 and 65995–65998 include provisions for levies against development projects near school districts. The levies are often called “school impact fees” because they go toward education. For commercial or industrial construction, Kings County school districts levy a school impact fee of \$0.33 per square foot of chargeable covered and enclosed space (Corl, 2001). The determination of chargeable and covered and enclosed space within the perimeter of a commercial or industrial structure will be made by the building department of the city or county issuing the building permit.

### **8.8.7 Proposed Conditions of Certification**

Proposed conditions of certification are included in Appendix K. With incorporation of the proposed conditions, the HPP will comply with all applicable LORS and will not result in significant socioeconomic impacts.

### **8.8.8 Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts**

The following public service agencies were contacted in the course of the socioeconomic investigation to check on levels of activity and expected impacts of the proposed project.

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
Kings County Auditor	Ute Dorna Harold Nikoghosian	(559) 582-3211
Kings County Office of Education	Cathy Marroquin Steve Corl	(559) 584-1441

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
Lemoore Union High School District	Marten Powers	(559) 924-6610
Central Union Elementary School District	Jack Bogard	(559) 924-3405
Kings County Planning Department	Chuck Kinney, Planner	(559) 582-3211
Kings County Fire Department	Mike Virden	(559) 582-3211
Kings County Sheriff's Department	Brian Wheat	(559) 582-3211

**8.8.9 Compliance with Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards**

Table 8.8-16 summarizes HPP with compliance applicable LORS pertaining to socioeconomic impacts.

**8.8.10 Permits Required and Permit Schedule**

There are no specific permits to protect socioeconomic values. See Sections 8.4 (Land Use), 8.6 (Public Health), and 8.7 (Worker Health and Safety) for permits relating to land use and public health and safety issues.

**8.8.11 References**

Belluomini, Jackie, 2001. Telephone communication between Jackie Belluomini, Greater Bakersfield Convention and Visitors Bureau, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. June 18, 2001.

Bogard, Jack, 2001. Telephone communication between Jack Bogard, Central Union Elementary School District, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. June 20, 2001.

Bonner, Anna, 2001. Telephone communication between Anna Bonner, Lemoore Union High School District, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. June 20, 2001

California Birth Defects Monitoring Program (CBDMP), 1999. California Department of Health Services Environmental Health Investigations Branch. Birth Defects in McFarland. April 1999.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Desk book, 2001.

CDF, 2001. Population and other demographics information on California Department of Finance (CDF) websites: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/90e-4.xls>, [http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/Hist\\_E-4.xls](http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/Hist_E-4.xls),

<http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/projco.pdf>,  
<http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/E-5.xls>.

CEC, 2000. California Energy Commission Rationale For Adoption of Emergency Regulations to Implement to Six-Month Power Plant Licensing Process. November 15, 2000.

Cooke, Raymond, 2001. Kings County Division of Environmental Health Services. Telephone number: (559) 584-1411. Personal Communication with Angela Liang (URS Oakland) on June 28.

Corl, Steve, 2001. Telephone communication between Steve Corl, Kings County Office of Education, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. June 14, 2001.

DOE, 2001. State of California Department of Education (DOE). Data Quest, School and District Profiles. [www.cde.ca.gov](http://www.cde.ca.gov).

Dorna, Ute, 2001. Telephone and email communication between Ute Dorna, Kings County Planning Department, Auditor's Office, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. June 13 and 19, 2001.

EDD, 2001a. Kings County Snapshot. California State Employment Development Department (EDD). [www.calmis.ca.gov/file/Cosnaps/KingsSNAP.pdf](http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/Cosnaps/KingsSNAP.pdf). June 18, 2001.

EDD, 2001b. Labor market information. Current employment and labor force information. California State Employment Development Department (EDD).  
<http://www.calmis.ca.gov/htmlfile/subject/indtable.htm> and  
<http://calmis.ca.gov/FILE/LFHIST/00AASUB.TXT>

EDD, 2001c. Labor market information. Employment by Industry Data, Kings County. California State Employment Development Department (EDD).  
<http://www.calmis.ca.gov/htmlfile/subject/indtable.htm>.

EDD, 2001d. Labor Market Information Division. California State Employment Development Department (EDD). Information obtained from websites:  
<http://www.calmis.cahwnet.gov/file/indhis/kingshaw.xls> and  
<http://www.calmis.cahwnet.gov/file/indhist/bakeshaw.xls> and  
<http://www.calmis.cahwnet.gov/file/indhist/freshhaw.xls> and  
<http://www.calmis.cahwnet.gov/file/indhist/turarhaw.xls>

Executive Order 12898, 1994. *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations*. 1994.

FCVB, 2001. Fresno Convention and Visitors Bureau (FCVB), Information from websites:  
<http://www.fresnocvb.org/Interactive/lodging/search.php3>;  
<http://www.fresnocvb.org/maps&facts/intro.htm>. June 18, 2001.

- Fillmore, Tim, 2001. Telephone communication between Tim Fillmore, Supervising Environmental Health Officer, Kings County Health Department, Division of Environmental Health Services, and Steven Appleton, URS Corporation. July 10, 2001.
- GWF, 2000. Hanford Energy Park Application for Small Power Plant Exemption, Socioeconomics section. 2000.
- KEDC, 2001. Kings Economic Development Council (KEDC). <http://www.kingsedc.org>
- Kieffer, Paul, 2001. Email communication between Paul Kieffer, GWF, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. June 19, 2001.
- Kings County, 1993. Kings County General Plan Environmental Impacts Analysis.
- Kings County, 2001a. Kings County Fire Department website: <http://www.countyofkings.com/fire/index.htm>.
- Kings County, 2001b. Kings County website: <http://www.countyofkings.com/>
- Kings County, 2001c. County of Kings 2000-2001 Final Budget. Volume II Budget Schedules and Details. Schedules 4 and 7. Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2001.
- Kinney, 2001. Telephone and fax communication between Chuck Kinney, Kings County Association of Governments, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. June 15 and 21, 2001.
- Neutra, Dr. Raymond, 2001. Telephone communication between Dr. Raymond Neutra, Chief Director of Occupational and Environmental Disease Control, California Department of Health Services, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. July 19, 2001.
- Nikoghosian, Harold, 2001. Telephone and fax communication between Harold Nikoghosian, Kings County Auditor's Office, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. June 18 and 20, 2001.
- Powers, Marten, 2001. Telephone communication between Marten Powers, Lemoore Union High School District, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. June 21, 2001.
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD), 2001. Fax communication between San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Leland Villavoz) and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. August 2, 2001.
- Tulare County, 2001. Tulare County website. <http://www.co.tulare.ca.us>, July 9, 2001.

- U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990. 1990 Census. Lookup Page website: <http://www.census.gov/>.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990. U.S. Census Data, 1990 Census. Lookup Files. Summary Tape File 3A. July, 2001.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000. U.S. Census Data, 2000 Census. American Fact Finder.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000. 2000 Census. American Fact Finder website: <http://www.census.gov/>.
- U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 2000a. *Draft Title VI Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs*.
- U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 2000b. *Draft Revised Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits*.
- Viriden, Mike, 2001. Telephone communication between Mike Viriden, Fire Marshall, Kings County Fire Department, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. June 18, 2001.
- VISTA, 2001. Vista Information Systems, Inc. Site Assessment Reports. July 5, 2001.
- Wheat, Brian, 2001. Telephone communication between Brian Wheat, Assistant Sheriff, Kings County Sheriff's Department, and Katie McKinstry, URS Corporation. June 18, 2001.

**TABLES**

**Table 8.8-1  
Employment (2000)**

<b>Area</b>	<b>Labor Force</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Unemployment</b>	<b>Percent Unemployment Rate</b>
City of Avenal	2,450	1,930	520	21.2
City of Corcoran	3,920	3,290	630	16.1
City of Hanford	16,900	14,820	2,080	12.3
City of Lemoore	6,970	5,970	1,000	14.3
City of Huron	2,970	2,530	440	14.8
Kings County	45,900	39,480	6,420	14.0
Kern County	287,200	254,700	32,500	11.3
Fresno County	393,000	336,800	56,200	14.3
Tulare County	170,000	143,900	26,200	15.4
<b>State Total</b>	<b>17,090,800</b>	<b>16,245,600</b>	<b>845,200</b>	<b>4.9</b>

Source: EDD, 2001b. Not seasonally adjusted. Information obtained from websites at  
<http://www.calmis.ca.gov/htmlfile/subject/indtable.htm>  
<http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/lffhist/00aasub.txt>

**Table 8.8-2**  
**Kings County Employment**

	1998	Percent of Category	1999	Percent of Category	Percent Change
Total Farm	7,780	22%	6,890	19%	-11%
Farm Production	4,260	55%	3,830	56%	-10%
Farm Services	3,520	45%	3,060	44%	-13%
Total Nonfarm	27,750	78%	28,630	81%	3%
Goods Producing	4,290	15%	4,480	16%	4%
Construction & Mining	930	22%	1,030	23%	11%
Manufacturing	3,370	79%	3,450	77%	2%
Service Producing	23,460	85%	24,150	84%	3%
Transportation & Public Utilities	810	3%	780	3%	-4%
Transportation	550	68%	520	67%	-5%
Communications & Public Util.	260	32%	260	33%	0%
Trade	6,530	28%	6,420	27%	-2%
Wholesale Trade	980	15%	1,000	16%	2%
Retail Trade	5,550	85%	5,420	84%	-2%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	700	3%	750	3%	7%
Services	4,930	21%	5,160	21%	5%
Hotels & Other Lodging Places	130	3%	120	2%	-8%
Health Services	2,230	45%	2,070	40%	-7%
Other Services	2,580	52%	2,970	58%	15%
Government	10,500	45%	11,040	46%	5%
Federal Government	1,140	11%	1,070	10%	-6%
State Government	4,140	39%	4,500	41%	9%
Local Government	5,210	50%	5,470	50%	5%
<b>Total, All Industries</b>	<b>35,530</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>35,520</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>

Note: Labor force data are by place of residence; data include self-employed individuals, unpaid family workers, household domestic workers, and workers on strike. Industry employment is by place of work; it excludes self-employed individuals, unpaid family workers, household domestic workers, and workers on strike.

Source: EDD, 2001d.

**Table 8.8-3  
Kern County Employment**

	1998	Percent of Category	1999	Percent of Category	Percent Change
Total Farm	46,500	20%	44,900	19%	-3%
Farm Production	17,300	37%	17,700	39%	2%
Farm Services	29,200	63%	27,200	61%	-7%
Total Nonfarm	184,300	80%	188,900	81%	2%
Goods Producing	28,900	16%	27,900	15%	-3%
Mining	9,100	31%	8,200	29%	-10%
Construction	9,900	34%	10,000	36%	1%
Manufacturing	9,900	34%	9,700	35%	-2%
Service Producing	155,400	84%	160,900	85%	4%
Transportation & Public Utilities	11,000	7%	11,200	7%	2%
Transportation	7,500	68%	7,900	71%	5%
Communications/Public Util.	3,400	31%	3,300	29%	-3%
Trade	42,800	28%	44,500	28%	4%
Wholesale Trade	8,200	19%	8,700	20%	6%
Retail Trade	34,600	81%	35,800	80%	3%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	7,200	5%	7,300	5%	1%
Services	45,600	29%	47,500	30%	4%
Business Services	10,500	23%	10,600	22%	1%
Health Services	13,500	30%	14,200	30%	5%
Engineering & Management	4,700	10%	5,100	11%	9%
Other Services	16,900	37%	17,600	37%	4%
Government	48,800	31%	50,300	31%	3%
Federal Government	9,700	20%	9,800	19%	1%
State Government	6,500	13%	6,700	13%	3%
Local Government	32,600	67%	33,900	67%	4%
<b>Total, All Industries</b>	<b>230,800</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>233,700</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1%</b>

Note: Labor force data are by place of residence; data include self-employed individuals, unpaid family workers, household domestic workers, and workers on strike. Industry employment is by place of work; it excludes self-employed individuals, unpaid family workers, household domestic workers, and workers on strike.

Source: EDD, 2001d.

**Table 8.8-4  
Fresno County Employment**

	1998	Percent of Category	1999	Percent of Category	Percent Change
Total Farm	58,700	19%	57,100	18%	-3%
Farm Production	23,800	41%	23,500	41%	-1%
Farm Services	34,900	59%	33,600	59%	-4%
Total Nonfarm	253,600	81%	261,400	82%	3%
Goods Producing	40,800	16%	42,400	16%	4%
Mining and Construction	13,800	34%	14,800	35%	7%
Manufacturing	27,000	66%	27,600	65%	2%
Service Producing	212,800	84%	219,000	84%	3%
Transportation & Public	12,500	6%	12,500	6%	0%
Utilities					
Transportation	7,900	63%	7,800	62%	-1%
Communications & Public	4,600	37%	4,600	37%	0%
Utilities					
Trade	62,200	29%	63,400	29%	2%
Wholesale Trade	14,600	23%	14,500	23%	-1%
Retail Trade	47,700	77%	48,800	77%	2%
Finance, Insurance & Real	13,400	6%	13,800	6%	3%
Estate					
Services	65,600	31%	67,900	31%	4%
Business Services	11,800	18%	12,000	18%	2%
Health Services	21,900	33%	21,700	32%	-1%
Other Services	31,900	49%	34,200	50%	7%
Government	59,100	28%	61,600	28%	4%
Federal Government	10,700	18%	10,800	18%	1%
State Government	7,800	13%	8,400	14%	8%
Local Government	40,600	69%	42,500	69%	5%
<b>Total All Industries</b>	<b>312,300</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>318,500</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2%</b>

Note: Labor force data are by place of residence; data include self-employed individuals, unpaid family workers, household domestic workers, and workers on strike. Industry employment is by place of work; it excludes self-employed individuals, unpaid family workers, household domestic workers, and workers on strike.

Source: EDD, 2001d.

**Table 8.8-5  
Labor Union Contacts**

<b>Local Union</b>	<b>No. of Members and Areas Covered</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
Aluminum, Brick, and Glass Workers, Local No. 474-6	200–Central Valley/Fresno	(559) 264-5342
Auto Mechanics and Machinists Union, Local No. 653	1,300–from Merced to Bakersfield	(559) 264-2815
Auto Mechanics and Machinists Union	10	(805) 322-7925
Bricklayers and Tilelayers, Local No. 4	Not available	(805) 832-0255
Carpenter’s, Local No. 701	700–Fresno, Tulare, Kings, & Madera Counties	(559) 266-0273
Carpenter’s, Local No.743	600–Kings, Inyo, & Mono Counties	(805) 327-1429
Construction Local No.12	600–Kings, Inyo, & Mono Counties. Can draw from southern California and southern Nevada.	(805) 325-9491
Electrical Workers, Local No. 100	550–Fresno, Tulare, Kings, & Madera Counties	(559) 251-8241
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local No. 428	70 (more available if needed)	(805) 323-2979
Iron Workers, Local No. 155	500–All of the Central Valley and Southern California	(559) 251-7388
Laborers, Local No. 294	800–Fresno, Tulare, Kings, & Madera Counties	(559) 255-3019
Laborers’ International Union of North America Local No. 220	325 active/250 retirees, some available for work	(805) 322-3460
Painters, Local No. 294	220–Fresno, Tulare, Kings, & Madera Counties	(559) 255-2113
Painters, Local No. 52	200–(6 counties)/50 in Kings	(805) 325-1825
Plasters and Cement Masons, Local No. 300, Area 188	265 active–Fresno, Tulare, Kings, & Madera Counties	(559) 251-8259
Plasters and Cement Masons, Local No. 600	50–Kings County; 1,200–Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, Inyo, & Mono Counties	(805) 323-6018
Plasters Union, Local No. 200	5–10 Kings–membership covers all of Southern California, have a large pool to draw from	(800) 559-2701
Plumbers, Local No. 460	Not available	(559) 252-7246
Plumbers and Steamfitters, Local No. 460	600	(805) 589-4600
Roofers and Waterproofers, Local No. 27	225–Mostly Fresno area	(559) 255-0933

**Table 8.8-5 (continued)**  
**Labor Union Contacts**

<b>Local Union</b>	<b>No. of Members and Areas Covered</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
Sheet Metal Workers, Local No. 162	1,800–Fresno, Tulare, Kings, & Madera Counties	(559) 255-0454
Teamster Union, Local No. 431	25–30–Fresno, Tulare, Kings, & Madera Counties	(559) 486-5410
Teamster Union, Local No. 87	30–40 for construction. Can have many more if needed.	(805) 327-8594

Source: GWF, 2000.

**Table 8.8-6  
Historical and Projected Population Growth**

<b>Area</b>	<b>January 1981</b>	<b>April 1990</b>	<b>January 1999</b>	<b>January 2000</b>	<b>July 2010</b>
City of Avenal	4,160	9,770	12,250	13,100	17,700
City of Corcoran	6,550	13,360	20,700	21,550	24,600
City of Hanford	21,550	30,463	39,350	41,000	59,400
City of Lemoore	9,275	13,622	17,900	18,800	27,900
City of Huron	2,830	4,766	5,675	5,875	N/A
Unincorporated Kings County	33,500	34,254	35,600	36,750	N/A
Kings County	75,100	101,469	125,800	131,200	154,617
Kern County	412,800	544,981	645,900	658,900	859,818
Fresno County	523,200	667,490	789,700	805,000	953,457
Tulare County	250,800	311,921	363,433	367,961	469,509
<b>California</b>	<b>24,039,000</b>	<b>29,758,213</b>	<b>33,766,000</b>	<b>34,336,000</b>	<b>39,957,616</b>

Note: The Kings County row is a summation of the cities of Avenal, Corcoran, Hanford, and Lemoore and unincorporated Kings County. The summation may not be exact due to rounding.

Sources: CDF, 2001; Kinney, 2001.

N/A = not available

**Table 8.8-7**  
**Annual Average Population Growth Rates**

	<b>Percent 1981–1990</b>	<b>Percent 1990–2000</b>	<b>Percent 1981–2000</b>	<b>Percent 2000–2010<sup>a</sup></b>
City of Avenal	10.0	3.0	6.2	3.1
City of Corcoran	8.2	4.9	6.5	1.3
City of Hanford	3.9	3.0	3.4	3.8
City of Lemoore	4.4	3.3	3.8	4.0
City of Huron	6.0	2.0	3.9	N/A
Unincorporated Kings County	0.2	0.7	0.5	N/A
Kings County	3.4	2.6	3.0	1.7
Kern County	3.1	1.9	2.5	2.7
Fresno County	2.7	1.9	2.3	1.7
Tulare County	2.5	1.7	2.0	2.5
California	2.4	1.4	1.9	1.5

<sup>a</sup> Projected growth.  
Sources: CDF, 2001; Kinney, 2001.  
N/A = not available

**Table 8.8-8**  
**Demographic Profiles of Counties, Cities, and Census Tracts**

	<b>% Minority 1990<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>% Minority by Race Only 2000<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>% Hispanic/Latino 2000</b>	<b>% Living Below Poverty Level 1990</b>
State of California	42.6	40.5	32.3	12.2
Kings County	46.1	46.3	43.6	16.0
Fresno County	48.9	45.7	44.0	21.0
Kern County	37.0	38.4	38.4	16.4
Tulare County	45.0	42.0	51.0	22.2
City of Avenal	68.8	64.2	65.9	15.1
City of Corcoran	70.6	65.9	59.6	14.8
City of Hanford	37.7	35.9	38.7	15.5
City of Huron	98.6	79.6	98.3	44.1
City of Lemoore	35.7	40.7	30.5	13.8
Kings County:				
Census Tract 2	23.1	25.3	28.7	15.3
Census Tract 3	31.3	38.4	16.8	11.2
Census Tract 4.02	33.6	34.0	33.5	12.1
Census Tract 16.01/16	76.1	64.1	72.2	13.5
Fresno County:				
Census Tract 78	96.0	70.1	75.7	39.4

<sup>a</sup> Includes nonwhite races, and Hispanic whites.

<sup>b</sup> Does not account for Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. Includes persons listed as only one race and Black or African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, or some other race; and includes persons listed as more than one race.

The totals may not equal 100% because at "smaller geographic levels, the 100% counts for race will have expected differences" (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990). The differences between sample estimates and 100% counts for the American Indian and Hispanic origin are generally larger than for other groups. The major differences in the Hispanic percent count can be accounted for by the sample processing of Hispanic origin when the responder did not mark any ethnic category. When processing the entries, the Census Bureau used written entries for race as well as the response to questions asked on the sample, such as ancestry and place of birth.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000.

**Table 8.8-9**  
**Local and Regional Housing Estimates (January 2000)**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Housing Units</b>	<b>Occupied</b>	<b>Percent Vacancy</b>
City of Avenal	1,925	1,724	10.4
City of Corcoran	3,055	2,852	6.6
City of Hanford	14,553	13,606	6.5
City of Lemoore	6,668	6,366	4.5
Unincorporated	10,817	10,192	5.8
Kings County Total	37,018	34,740	6.2
Kern County	234,487	214,614	8.5
Fresno County	273,159	256,503	6.1
Tulare County	121,707	113,657	6.6
City of Huron	1,260	1,222	3.0

Source: CDF, 2001.

**Table 8.8-10**  
**Schools in the Vicinity of the Project Site**

<b>School District</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>2000-01 Enrollment</b>	<b>Enrollment Capacity</b>	<b>Over Capacity?</b>	<b>Projection 2001-2002</b>
Central Union Elementary School District	Akers Elementary	690	1,020 <sup>a</sup>	No	690
	Central Elementary	317	540 <sup>a</sup>	No	317
	Neutra Elementary	480	870 <sup>a</sup>	No	480
	Stratford Element.	325	510 <sup>a</sup>	No	325
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,812</b>	<b>2,940<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>No</b>	<b>1,812</b>
Lemoore Union High School District	Jamison (Donald C.) High	110	110	No	110
	Lemoore High	1,924	1,924	No	1,924
	Yokuts High	17	25	No	17
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,051</b>	<b>2,059</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>2,051</b>

<sup>a</sup> Assumes class size would increase and Central Union School District would not receive California state class-size reduction funds.  
Sources: DOE, 2001; Bogard, 2001; Bonner, 2001; Powers, 2001.

**Table 8.8-11**  
**Kings County Summary of Estimated Additional Financing Sources (\$ millions)**

Revenue Source	Adopted 1998/1999	Adopted 1999/2000	Adopted 2000/2001	Percent Change		
				1999/2000 to 2000/2001	Estimated 2001/02 <sup>a</sup>	Estimated 2002/03 <sup>a</sup>
Taxes	14.0	15.0	15.0	2%	15.0	16.0
Licenses and Permits	1.0	1.0	1.0	6%	1.0	1.0
Fines and Forfeits	-	-	0.5	14%	-	-
Use of Money and Property	2.0	2.0	2.0	2%	2.0	2.0
Intergovernmental Revenue	74.0	82.0	86.0	8%	93.0	100.0
Charges for Services	7.0	8.0	8.5	8%	9.0	10.0
Miscellaneous Revenues	1.0	1.0	2.0	66%	3.0	6.0
Other Financing Sources	-	3.0	20.0	853%	23.0	26.0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>99.0</b>	<b>111.0</b>	<b>136.0</b>		<b>147.0</b>	<b>161.0</b>

<sup>a</sup> The estimated revenues for 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 were based on the average annual percent change between 1998/1999 and 2000/2001 listed above and the adopted revenues for 2000/2001, except Other Financing Sources. Since the increase between 1999/2000 and 2000/2001 was so high, an average of the other rates' increases was used to project Other Financing Sources for 2001/2001 and 2002/2003.

Note: Numbers may not add exactly due to rounding.

Sources: Kings County, 2001c; Nikoghosian, 2001.

**Table 8.8-12**  
**Kings County Budget Appropriations (\$ millions)**

<b>Department</b>	<b>FY 1999/2000 Adopted Appropriations</b>	<b>FY 2000/2001 Adopted Appropriations</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>	<b>Percent of Funds 2000/2001</b>
General Government	9.2	9.8	6%	7%
Special Revenue	36.2	-	-100%	0%
Public Safety	3.4	37.8	1,004%	27%
Public Transportation	0.7	5.9	739%	4%
Internal Service Funds	12.7	0.8	-94%	1%
Health	44.7	14.7	-67%	11%
Welfare	1.3	42.1	3,086%	31%
Education	-	1.4		1%
Recreation	0.8	0.9	20%	1%
Capital Outlay	4.7	24.5	423%	18%
<b>Total Specific Financing</b>	<b>113.7</b>	<b>137.8</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>100%</b>

FY = Fiscal Year

Sources: Kings County, 2001c; Nikoghosian, 2001.

**Table 8.8-13  
Construction Personnel Requirements by Trade**

<b>Craft or Trade</b>	<b>Month of Construction</b>					<b>Total Person- Months</b>
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	
Boilermakers	0	5	9	8	2	24
Carpenters	12	10	4	4	0	30
Electricians	8	16	18	20	6	68
Insulation Workers	0	0	2	4	2	8
Iron Workers	10	6	4	4	0	24
Laborers	16	11	8	8	8	51
Millwrights	0	10	13	13	6	42
Operating Engineers	3	3	3	3	1	13
Painters	0	0	2	2	2	6
Pipefitters	4	20	20	20	8	72
Teamsters	1	1	1	1	1	5
Manual Staff Subtotals	54	82	84	87	36	343
Contractor Staff	6	6	6	6	6	30
<b>Total Site Staff</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>373</b>

**Table 8.8-14**  
**Construction Cost**

Type	Cost
Labor	\$8.1 million
Material and Equipment	\$58.9 million
Other Nonlabor Costs	\$17 million
<b>Total Construction Cost</b>	<b>\$84.0 million</b>

Source: Kieffer, 2001.

**Table 8.8-15**  
**Annual Operation and Maintenance Cost**

Type	Cost
Labor	\$140,000
Contract Maintenance, Materials and Supplies	\$2,350,000
<b>Total Cost of Annual Operation and Maintenance</b>	<b>\$2,490,000</b>

Source: Kieffer, 2001.

**Table 8.8-16**  
**HPP Summary of Compliance with Socioeconomic LORS**

<b>Authority</b>	<b>Administering Agency</b>	<b>Requirements</b>	<b>HPP Compliance</b>
Executive Order 12898 Environmental Justice	U.S. EPA	Agencies must develop strategies to focus on environmental conditions and human health in minority communities and low-income populations.	<b>Section 8.8.3 – Environmental Justice.</b> Project would not result in disproportionate impacts to low-income or minority populations.
CEQA	CEC	Analysis of potential environmental impacts in AFC.	<b>Section 8.8.2 – Environmental Consequences.</b> Environmental impacts (economic and/or social effects) are analyzed in the AFC.
California Government Code, Sections 53080, 65955–65997	Kings County	Provisions for school impact fees for development projects near school districts are included.	<b>Sections 8.8.1.3 – Affected Environment, Schools; and 8.8.2.5 – Environmental Consequences, Fiscal Impacts.</b> School development fees would be levied against the project.

